

Efforts to privatize Medicare are, of course, nothing new. Medicare beneficiaries have long been able to enroll in private Medicare plans. Their experience, however, does not bode well in a full-fledged privatization effort.

□ 1245

These managed care plans are already calling for higher government payments, they are dropping out of unprofitable markets, they are cutting back on benefits to America's elderly.

Managed care plans obviously are profit-driven and they simply do not tough it out when their profits are not realized. We learned this the hard way last year when 96 Medicare HMOs deserted more than 400,000 Medicare beneficiaries because the HMOs were not meeting their profit objectives.

Before Medicare was launched in 1965, more than one-half of the Nation's seniors had no health insurance. Private insurance was then the only option for the elderly. But insurers did not want seniors to join their plans because they knew that seniors would use their coverage. The private insurance market has changed considerably since then but it still avoids high-risk enrollees and, whenever possible, dodges the bill for high cost medical services.

The problem is not malice or greed, it is the expectation that private insurers can serve two masters: the bottom line and the common good. Logically looking at the bottom line, our system leaves 43 million people without health insurance, 11 million of whom are children. Only Medicare can insure the elderly and disabled population because the private market has failed to do so.

If we privatize Medicare, we are telling America that not all seniors deserve the same level of health care. We are betting on a private insurance system that puts its own private interests ahead of health care quality and ahead of a balanced Federal budget.

The goal is simple, Mr. Speaker. Let us keep Medicare the successful public program it has always been.

THE PEOPLE'S RIGHT TO KNOW

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I rise this afternoon, and first let me offer a debt of gratitude to my friend from Ohio who, in very Orwellian fashion, has offered the rhetoric of fear rather than facts that we will hear in Campaign 2000. Indeed, it is very revealing to now hear the "Mediscare" tactics of the left, to deny the fact that the very reason the Medicare trustees say that Medicare's life has been lengthened was because of the new majority's plan to save Medicare that we successfully enacted after the jihad that was waged against us, politically speaking, in 1996 with a liberal Mediscare plan.

It is also worth noting, while we are in the neighborhood, Mr. Speaker, that the bipartisan commission, headed by the gentleman from Louisiana in the other body, and the gentleman from California with whom I am pleased to serve on the House Committee on Ways and Means offered a variety of avenues that give seniors, our most honored citizens, a variety of choices. It is revealing that there are those who would like to limit the freedom of Americans to make choices in their own interests.

But I rise today, Mr. Speaker, to speak of another matter that goes directly to the core of our survival as a constitutional republic. It is, Mr. Speaker, the people's right to know. Mr. Speaker, in the very near future, it is my understanding that Johnny Chung will testify before the House Committee on Government Reform about contributions, political contributions the Communist Chinese Government made to the Clinton/Gore campaign and to the Democratic National Committee in 1996. It has been interesting, Mr. Speaker, to note the coverage, or perhaps lack thereof, of this important issue in the Nation's press.

Now, to be sure, Mr. Speaker, I understand full well the nature and the scope of the first amendment to the Constitution, Congress shall make no law abridging freedom of the press, nor would I ever advocate such a dereliction or disruption of our first amendment rights. But it is fair, Mr. Speaker, in the marketplace of ideas to ask my former colleagues in television, where will they be when Johnny Chung comes before the congressional committee to testify about these contributions?

We should also say in passing, a tip of the rhetorical hat is necessary to many publications, whether the New York Times, the Washington Times, the Los Angeles Times, the Washington Post, many mainstream publications who have chronicled the abuses.

But now, Mr. Speaker, it is time for my former colleagues in television to step up, specifically those news networks that are available via cable with 24-hour-a-day coverage. Without trying to set their agenda, but in the spirit of constructive criticism and open dialogue in a free republic, I would challenge the cable news networks, I would challenge public broadcasting, to follow the example of C-SPAN.

And from this vantage point I can say, Mr. Speaker, that we congratulate C-SPAN on 20 years of service to the American people, bringing to the people of our Nation an unvarnished, straight conduit of what happens in the halls of Congress, what happens on the floor of this House and what happens in the many committee rooms.

But I would welcome far more exposure of these hearings. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, one is tempted to look at the recent promotional campaign of the Public Broadcasting Service and the rhetorical question that is asked: "If PBS won't do it, who will?"

Indeed, I think of the recent past when I was a private citizen in the 1980s, the mid- to late-1980s, seeing on public television gavel-to-gavel coverage of the confirmation hearings of Judge Bork, the confirmation hearings eventually of Mr. Justice Thomas, and all the mainstream media scrutiny. How much more important it is then, Mr. Speaker, that the media devote its considerable energies and its agenda-setting ability to checking into these disturbing allegations that go to the very fabric of our constitutional Republic.

For, Mr. Speaker, if there are those both within and outside government who seek to influence decisions and policy for another government that wishes us ill, the consequences for our national survival are grave indeed.

COMPREHENSIVE ELECTRIC RESTRUCTURING BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, deregulation of the airlines, natural gas, railroads, telecommunications, and trucking industries yields annual savings equal to nearly 1 percent of America's gross domestic product. This Congress, we will attempt to craft a measure that will finally and successfully unleash competition and savings from utility reform, electric deregulation.

In recent years, competition has replaced regulation for the electric power industry in a number of nations, including the United Kingdom, New Zealand, Norway, Chile and Argentina. Many took a very long-term approach to this process. The United States faces a unique situation in that our electric power industry is largely already privatized. So we must focus on alternating our current system and effectively fostering more competition.

This should not be done through a Federal mandate. Clearly, we would be wise to make the State-mandated restructuring more efficient instead of imposing a separate Federal mandate. I see the ideal measure as one that fosters competition, avoids Federal mandates and lowers rates for all consumers. To create this legislation, we must eliminate outdated laws, inject fairness into the process, and delineate the proper roles of the Federal Government and State governments. But do not misunderstand me: Reforming the electric industry is no simple matter. This is an enormous undertaking. Congress considers the livelihoods of entire industries constitutional questions and the interests of the entire rate-paying public in addressing this very complex issue. Accordingly, we must address these points to fully realize the benefits of energy reform. Every consumer must benefit from this deregulation, not just the large industrial users of electricity. I am concerned that any